



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/901,988

07/10/2001

Clive Tang

NC17536

7923

30973

7590

10/27/2005

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 SHERRY LANE
SUITE 1400
DALLAS, TX 75225

EXAMINER

MEEK, JACOB M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2637

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/901,988

Applicant(s)

TANG, CLIVE

Examiner

Jacob Meek

Art Unit

2637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 11, 13 - 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 11, 13 - 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 5, 9 – 11, 12, 16 - 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claim 1 – 11, 13 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balachandran et al (US-6,108,374).

With regard to claim 1, Balachandran discloses an apparatus for a 1st communication station operable to transmit data upon a communication channel, apparatus for dynamically selecting at least a 1st switching used in selection of a modulation parameter (see column 10, line 57 – column 11, line 35), apparatus comprising: a calculator adapted to received indications of a selected communication indicia associated with communication characteristics of communication channel during a selected interval (see figure 12, 212 and column 11, lines 1- 7), calculator configured to select at least the 1st switching threshold (see column 11, lines 7 –9), 1st switching threshold changeable responsive to changes in selected communications indicia (see column 11, lines 28 – 35), and 1st switching threshold selected by calculator to at least satisfy a 1st and 2nd performance criteria (see column 9, lines 1 – 30). While nomenclature of Balachandran is different than that of applicant, the functionality appears equivalent and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

With regard to claim 2, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein selection of 1st selection criteria by calculator maximizes the 1st performance criteria while also satisfying at

Art Unit: 2637

least the 2nd performance criteria (see column 11, lines 1 – 7, where this is interpreted as 1st and 2nd performance criteria).

With regard to claim 3, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein selected communication indicia to which calculator is coupled to receive indications thereof comprises error indicia representative of errors introduced upon data during communication upon communication channel (see figure 12, 200, 210 and column 11, lines 1 – 7).

With regard to claim 4, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein data comprises frame-formatted data and wherein calculator is coupled to receive error indicia. Balachandran discloses the use of SINR as error indicia, but states FER is a valid alternative (see column 9, lines 1 – 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that FER would be a viable choice of error indicia.

With regard to claim 5, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein data transmitted by 1st communication station is transmitted to 2nd communication station (see figure 12, 190, 196); wherein 2nd station is coupled to in a feedback arrangement with 1st communication to return to the 1st communication station a report representative of the communication characteristics of communication channel (see column 11, lines 1 – 7), and wherein selected communication indicia to which calculator is coupled to receive is based upon report returned to 1st communication station (see column 11, lines 7 – 35).

With regard to claim 6, Balachandran discloses an apparatus for calculating and reporting a moving average of received data (see column 11, lines 23 – 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention that there would be a lag time in adjustment of parameters due to propagation delays.

With regard to claim 7, Balachandran is silent with respect to throughput indicia, as such. Balachandran discloses his apparatus is intended to improve throughput and bandwidth

Art Unit: 2637

efficiency (see column 1, lines 25 – 33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to monitor throughput as a system criteria.

With regard to claim 8, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein selected communication indicia to which calculator is coupled to receive error indicia. Balachandran discloses the use of SINR as error indicia, but states FER is a valid alternative (see column 9, lines 1 – 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that FER would be a viable choice of error indicia.

With regard to claim 9, Balachandran discloses an apparatus comprising a modulation parameter selector coupled to calculator (see figure 12, 192), modulation parameter selector for selecting modulation parameter by which data is operated upon by 1st communication station prior to transmission upon the communication channel (see column 11, lines 7 – 35).

With regard to claim 10, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein modulation parameter comprises a modulation type by which the data is modulated by 1st communication station (see column 10, lines 13 – 56).

With regard to claim 11, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein modulation parameter comprises an encoding rate by which the data is encoded by 1st communication station (see column 11, lines 28 – 35).

With regard to claim 13, Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that “learns” (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran’s functionality differs slightly from applicant’s claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

With regard to claim 14, Balachandran discloses two inputs to his algorithm (see figure 12, 200, 210). Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses

Art Unit: 2637

an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that "learns" (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran's functionality differs slightly from applicant's claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

With regard to claim 15, Balachandran discloses two inputs to his algorithm (see figure 12, 200, 210). Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that "learns" (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran's functionality differs slightly from applicant's claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, the steps claimed as method are nothing more than a restatement of the function of the specific components of the apparatus claimed above (claims 1 and 2, respectively) and, therefore it would have been obvious, considering the aforementioned rejection of claims 1 and 2.

With regard to claim 18, Balachandran discloses an apparatus wherein operation of selecting 1st switching threshold is performed by executing an algorithm (see column 11, lines 1 – 7). Balachandran is silent with respect to processor, however the use of an algorithm implies the use of a processor and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

With regard to claim 19, Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that "learns" (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran's functionality differs slightly from applicant's claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

Art Unit: 2637

With regard to claim 20, Balachandran discloses two inputs to his algorithm (see figure 12, 200, 210). Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that “learns” (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran’s functionality differs slightly from applicant’s claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

With regard to claim 21, Balachandran discloses an apparatus for a 1st communication station operable to transmit data upon a communication channel, apparatus for dynamically selecting at least a 1st switching used in selection of a modulation parameter (see column 10, line 57 – column 11, line 35), apparatus comprising: a calculator adapted to received indications of a selected communication indicia associated with communication characteristics of communication channel during a selected interval (see figure 12, 212 and column 11, lines 1- 7), calculator configured to select at least the 1st switching threshold (see column 11, lines 7 –9), 1st switching threshold changeable responsive to changes in selected communications indicia (see column 11, lines 28 – 35), and 1st switching threshold selected by calculator to at least satisfy a 1st and 2nd performance criteria (see column 9, lines 1 – 30). Balachandran is silent with respect to processor, however the use of an algorithm implies the use of a processor and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. Balachandran is silent with respect to LRI algorithm. Balachandran discloses an apparatus utilizing an adaptive technique that “learns” (see column 9, line 31 – column 10, line 11). While arrangement of Balachandran’s functionality differs slightly from applicant’s claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rearrange calculation functionality.

Other Cited Prior Art

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Edwards et al (US-6,198,734) discloses an adaptive radio communications systems that discloses many aspects of applicant's claimed invention.

Heath, Jr. et al (US-6,298,092) discloses a method for adaptively controlling communication parameters in a wireless system.

Yoshida (US-6,452,964) discloses an adaptive modulation technique related to applicant's claimed invention.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2637

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Meek whose telephone number is (571)272-3013. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571)272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JMM
10/21/05



10/21/05
JEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Meek